La présentation de l'ouvrage est extrêmement soignée. Jaquette, reliure, typographie, lettrines, illustrations, tout y est impeccable. Malheureusement, le sujet est bien mince; Brown, à qui l'on doit déjà une dizaine d'articles sur cette même question, aurait ici gagné à condenser son propos. Là où un article de synthèse aurait suffi, elle a cru devoir rédiger un livre de 300 pages en divisant artificiellement la matière, pour mieux en éclairer les divers angles et en explorer les coins et les recoins. Ce faisant, elle affaiblit son propos. Chacun des chapitres examine un aspect ténu de la question. Or, comme les témoins appelés à la barre ne sont que cinq, on les voit revenir inlassablement de chapitre en chapitre. Le procédé, répétitif par nature, ne peut que lasser à la longue, d'autant plus que l'analyse, excessivement pointilleuse, finit par devenir verbeuse et exaspérante. Il y a là une grave erreur de composition, contre laquelle aucune des nombreuses personnes que Cynthia Brown remercie dans l'avant-propos ne paraît l'avoir mise en garde. Le lecteur se perd dans le labyrinthe des menus détails et dans la forêt des oeuvres (souvent fort mineures) qui passent et repassent d'un chapitre à l'autre. Au lieu de convoquer tous les témoins quatre ou cinq fois pour leur poser chaque fois une nouvelle question, pourquoi ne pas leur avoir consacré chacun un chapitre? L'ouvrage aurait été à la fois plus clair et plus agréable. Tel qu'il est construit, il s'apparente à un instrument de torture raffiné; Brown semble prendre plaisir à y soumettre et les témoins et le lecteur.

YVAN G. LEPAGE, *Université d'Ottawa*

Ignacio Navarrete. *Orphans of Petrarch: Poetry and Theory in the Spanish Renaissance*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994. Pp. x, 297.

In *Orphans of Petrarch*, Ignacio Navarrete studies Petrarchism from several different points of view: (1) the omnipresence of direct and indirect imitations of Petrarch and earlier Spanish and Italian Petrarchists throughout Renaissance literature in Spain; (2) the (self)orphaning of Spanish Renaissance poets who, by claiming Petrarch as a father, eliminate the idea of their own indebtedness to earlier Spanish poets; (3) a constant and ever-present Spanish rivalry with Italy which is seen as the great cultural and literary challenge; (4) the theory of belatedness which underlines the predicament of the followers of Petrarch who feel that everything has already been said; and (5) the idea of an imperial language, which first surfaces with Nebrija and is still alive at the time of Góngora and Quevedo.

In order to achieve this ambitious plan, Navarrete examines the Italian background to Spanish literature and shows how Spanish poets (he analyzes the poetry of Boscán, Garcilaso, Herrera, Góngora, and Quevedo) and theorists (in particular, Santillana, Nebrija, Encina, Boscán, Argote de Molina, Sánchez de las Brozas, Ambrosio de Morales, and Fernando de Herrera) react to and continue a dialogue with Petrarch and his followers.

There are many good things to say about Navarrete's *Orphans of Petrarch*. A comparatively recent theory (Bloom's *Anxiety of Influence*) is applied to an old theme, and that old theme (Petrarchism) is interpreted in a revolutionary new light by means of which the traditional meaning of *imitation* and *influence* is challenged. This clearly ties directly into Harold Bloom's revisionist psychoanalytical literary theory as expressed in *The Anxiety of Influence*. In addition to a new, and often convincing, reading of selected Spanish Petrarchists, Navarrete examines in some detail several important but often forgotten Spanish literary theorists. Further, there are new readings of Boscán: the unity of Book II of his verse; of Garcilaso: Navarrete's enlightened interpretation of the third eclogue; of Herrera: the attempted refocussing of Spanish literary history; of Góngora: the renewed emphasis upon the Petrarchan imagery of the *Polifemo*; and Quevedo: the reading of the *Poems to Lisi* as a genuine, meaningful sequence which establishes its own semantic field. All of this is thought-provoking and will lead readers to rethink and revalue their traditional positions and preconceived ideas regarding Petrarchan poetry in Spain.

This said, the following criticism is in order. By failing to distinguish between the Spanish Renaissance and the Spanish Baroque, Navarrete regrettably diminishes the historic roles of Góngora and Quevedo. They are reduced from the leaders of two accepted Baroque schools (*culteranismo* and *conceptismo*) into mindless Renaissance marchers behind a very distant Petrarchan drum. Moreover, the failure to recognize the new linguistic codes created within the Spanish language by these two major, innovative poets belittles the very real poetic achievements of both.

This criticism points to an even deeper problem. If the book has a major failing, it is the difficulties encountered in the interpretations, not of broad theories, but of individual texts. For example, when analyzing the Quevedo poem "En cresspa tempestad de el oro undoso" (pp. 216-218), only five critics are cited: Molho (1978), ter Horst (1980), Blanco Morel (1983), Smith (1987), and Walters (1988). I will admit that these are good critics (certainly among the best that have written about this poem), but there are others, some of them very important; for example, Carlos Consiglio, James O. Crosby, J. Domínguez Caparrós, Manuel Durán, Jaime A. Montesinos, Julián Olivares, A. A. Parker, Octavio Paz, R. M. Price, M. Roig Miranda, Luis Rosales, J. M. Sobré, and Arthur Terry (two articles). In the case of "Cerrar podrá mis ojos," the gap between the number of articles cited by Navarrete (11, pp. 220-225 and 264-265) and those that he might also have quoted (approximately 38) is even greater.

What, perhaps, is even more worrying is that although Navarrete mentions Robert ter Horst's article "Death and Resurrection in the Quevedo Sonnet 'En cresspa tempestad'" (1980), I do not think that the information in that article is fully incorporated into the text. Quevedo seems to go beyond wishful thinking and to be in the presence of Lisi when she is combing her hair, a most proximate intimacy. Note that Lisi's hair seems to be undone: "si el cabello deslazaras generoso." The deeply sensual, if not explicitly sexual, imagery of the poem, as underlined by ter Horst, is enormously increased in the light of E. R. Rogers' excellent study of the effects of the

lady combing ("A Buffer for a Taboo, Combing," 1980). Although Navarrete mentions the sensuality of the poem in a passing reference to ter Horst's article, by concentrating on the Petrarchan nature of the conceit, he fails to emphasize enough the enormous thematic and linguistic changes that have taken place between the Spanish Renaissance and the Baroque. Thus, it is hard to agree with Navarrete when he writes that the "entire poem is based on rather trivial, time-worn comparisons, hyperbolically expanded and compounded by mythological allusions" (p. 217), for such a reading makes light of Quevedo's explosive language and marginalizes ter Horst's excellent interpretation.

In Quevedo's case, the innovation within his poetry lies partly (a) in the attempted destruction of Petrarchism (Quevedo "is come not to fulfill the Petrarchan tradition but to destroy it," p. 239); (b) in the whole process of defamiliarization / *desautomatización* (Pozuelo Yvancos, footnote 32, p. 265, and hence marginalized); and (c) more importantly, in what Blecua has called "el angustioso problema de la vida como muerte y de la inexorabilidad del tiempo" (p. 265, once again marginalized in a footnote). Finally, although Navarrete assures the reader that Petrarchism in Spain ends with Quevedo (pp. 233-240), it would not do to forget either the later works of Calderón or the clearly simplified Petrarchan imitations of Góngora that continue well into the eighteenth century.

ROGER GERALD MOORE, *St. Thomas University*

Victoria Kahn. *Machiavellian Rhetoric: From the Counter-Reformation to Milton*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994. Pp. xiv, 314.

Victoria Kahn's *Machiavellian Rhetoric* would be an intriguing study if for no other reason than its arguing that Renaissance political writers were more astute readers of their contemporaries' works than is generally recognized by modern commentators. It is also a daring study in that it offers a corrective reading to an influential body of modern historical scholarship on the import of Machiavellianism as a language of political discourse in the early modern period, scholarship exemplified in J. G. A. Pocock's magisterial work, *The Machiavellian Moment*. Kahn's study attempts to reorient our understanding of just what that "moment" entailed, especially for late-Renaissance English writers. In this endeavour she challenges Pocock (and others) both at the level of content (the specific claims he makes concerning the "substance" of Machiavellian political discourse) and at the level of methodology (how he goes about the work of reconstructing the language of Machiavellianism as it informed the writings of both Machiavelli and those who subsequently adapted that language to new ends).

There is certainly much to recommend in Kahn's revisionary work. Central to her argument is that the modern focus on Machiavellianism as a language of "secular republicanism" fails to understand how Machiavelli's work was actually read and